

Date: Tue, 2 Aug 94 04:30:18 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #343
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Tue, 2 Aug 94 Volume 94 : Issue 343

Today's Topics:

A quiet voice for Novice Class NOT time-limited
CW ...IS history! (2 msgs)
What is wrong with h (3 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Tue, 02 Aug 1994 01:10:44 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
swiss.ans.net!malgudi.oar.net!witch!ted!mjsilva@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: A quiet voice for Novice Class NOT time-limited
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <ZA+SjNS.darrylb@delphi.com>, darrylb@delphi.com (darrylb@delphi.com)
writes:

>Michael Silva <mjsilva@ted.win.net> writes:

>

>>The situation for a Novice is very different that that for a Tech. I
>>think the Novice privileges are much more in line with the testing
>>required than are the Tech privileges, where everything above 30MHz is
>>awarded by taking what for many (most?) is an *easier* test. I think the
>>carrot of more privileges is enough to motivate most Novices, but I don't
>>feel the same about the Tech license

>

>

>TheTech (no-code) takes the same written element as the Novice, plus one

>more. The Novice passes one code element that the Tech (no-code) has not.
>Seems like a fairly even trade off.

Accepting those elements as equally difficult, the privileges awarded for passing 3A are vastly greater than those awarded for passing 1A. More importantly, the privileges awarded per hour of study are *far* greater for the Tech than *any* other class of license. Thus, instead of providing a high incentive for learning more and upgrading, the extremely high privilege/effort ratio of the Tech license provides a *disincentive* to upgrading.

>

>How do you feel about the Tech Plus?

>

I don't understand why anyone would stop at Novice when 50MHz-to-daylight is 25 simple questions away.

Mike, KK6GM

Date: Mon, 1 Aug 1994 21:13:05 GMT
From: cadre!usenet@uunet.uu.net
Subject: CW ...IS history!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Actually, there is no more reliable mode for communications under noisy conditions, than CW! Whether it be a weak signal (riding at or near the noise floor) or a signal subject to interference, it can be copied most effectively by the human ear. The human ear has an amazing ability to discriminate between unwanted noise and the desired code stream. When all other modes fail, CW is sometimes the only mode that can cut the musturd - providing you have a trained ear. I have bagged many a DX station on QRP that I am convinced I would not have had a chance of working using other voice or digital modes...

It is for this reason and the natural enjoyment that people experience when conversing in a coded form, that CW will be around for a very very long time...

Dan KB1JX

Date: 1 Aug 1994 19:22:02 GMT
From: news.acns.nwu.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!cs.utexas.edu!convex!news.duke.edu!
news-feed-1.peachnet.edu!panther.Gsu.EDU!gatech!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!
newsrelay.iastate.edu!news.@@ihnp4.ucsd.edu

Subject: CW ...IS history!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <hA1RTVu.brunelli_pc@delphi.com>, brunelli_pc@delphi.com writes:
Pete, I agree 100% with your post!! I, too, learned CW to get the
priviledges. Now, I love it, and it is--or would be if I had the time
and was able to set up an HF station in my apartment--my major mode.
However, I agree that it is an outdated form of communication, and it
should not have veto power on any amateur radio exam.

Date: 1 Aug 1994 18:16:39 -0700
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!news.cerf.net!ccnet.com!ccnet.com!not-for-
mail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: What is wrong with h
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Alan Wilensky (alan.wilensky@channel1.com) wrote:

: I would think, that in Mr. Herman's opinion, those SSB conversations are
: being conducted by bootleg CB'ers....hand me the callbook Rochester,
: "yes Mr. Benny, (wasnt Jack Benny a Ham)?

: Is Vibroplex paying this guy Herman off? Come clean now Jeff.

Not being one of the inovative no-code techs, Jeff is still building
eighty meter transmitters from discarded color television sets. Since
there are no microphones in these sets for proper ssb operation, Jeff keys
his rigs with with preprogramed dots and dashes filed into the channel
changer. This doesn't leave much for the content or qso but we are all
having fun.

Bob

--

Bob Wilkins	work	bwilkins@cave.org
Berkeley, California	home	rwilkins@ccnet.com
94701-0710	play	n6fri@n6eeg.#nocal.ca.usa.noam

Date: 01 Aug 1994 18:22:52 GMT
From: news.acns.nwu.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!cis.ohio-state.edu!magnus.acs.ohio-
state.edu!csn!col.hp.com!sdd.hp.com!cs.utexas.edu!convex!news.duke.edu!news-
feed-1.peachnet.edu!@@ihnp4.ucsd.edu

Subject: What is wrong with h
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <wyn.82.2E3CF9F4@ornl.gov> wyn@ornl.gov (C. C. Wynn) writes:

>I did have to switch the product detector on though to make sure I got
>all of the CW QSO's. Maybe that is where the pro-no-code'rs are messing
>up the count.

Um, were you under the impression that the other modes are using AM?

Rich

--

Rich McAllister (rfm@eng.sun.com)

Date: Mon, 1 Aug 94 19:44:00 -0400
From: news.sprintlink.net!coyote.channel1.com!channel1!alan.wilensky@uunet.uu.net
Subject: What is wrong with h
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

JH>In article <40.2607.2427@channel1.com> alan.wilensky@channel1.com

JH>(Alan Wilensky) writes:

JH>>

JH>>I would think, that in Mr. Herman's opinion, those SSB conversations

JH>are >being conducted by bootleg CB'ers....hand me the callbook

JH>Rochester, >"yes Mr. Benny, (wasnt Jack Benny a Ham)?

JH>Check the attribution line, Al! It wasn't me who asked why the

JH>poster, wishing to convert his CB to 10M, wasn't listed in the

JH>callbook. I don't even own a callbook.

JH>Falsely attributing comments to someone isn't very nice.

JH>>Alan Wilensky, N1SS0

JH>Jeff NH6IL

No, I did not mean to implicate you as the poster, I just clipped that
quoted line out of your snipe at me (nauseating, etc.). No offense
intended.

Next time I'll track down the original poster. BTW, I dont totally
disagree with the self policing notion, I just got a kick about how the
guy was jumped on almost instantly.

Alan Wilensky, N1SS0
General Manager
Interactive Workplace Division
Vicom, LTD.
Phone: Edmonton Office
11603 165 St.
abm@world.std.com

, CmpQwk #UNREG, UNREGISTERED EVALUATION COPY

Date: Mon, 1 Aug 1994 11:58:43 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!jobone!ukma!
rsg1.er.usgs.gov!stc06.CTD.ORNL.GOV!xdepc.eng.ornl.gov!wyn@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <BowSzo3.brunelli_pc@delphi.com>, <wyn.77.2E39337A@ornl.gov>,
<1994Jul31.231532.23856@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>ic
Subject : Re: CW is FUN!! reprise

In article <1994Jul31.231532.23856@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary
Coffman) writes:

>In article <wyn.77.2E39337A@ornl.gov> wyn@ornl.gov (C. C. Wynn) writes:
>>

>>In case you haven't noticed, starting sometime this fall or winter, approx.
>>137 KHz of HF spectrum will be carved out for exclusive use of automatic
>>packet stations. These frequencies will be taken from CW/RTTY/Novice
>>operators. Think I am kidding? Check it out in the August QST. Who do you
>>propose to take your frequencies from? How about picking on the voice modes
>>for a change?

>In case *you* haven't noticed, what is actually happening is that
>automatic operation will become a *permitted* use on that small bit
>of spectrum. That's quite a bit different from it becoming *exclusive*.

In case you haven't noticed, when 50 automatic packet stations crank up
on these frequencies (that is 50 machines with no regard for anybody else
that may be trying to used these frequencies) the effect will be the same:
exclusive use of the frequencies.

73,
C. C. (Clay) Wynn N4AOX
wyn@ornl.gov

=====
= Cooperation requires participation. Competition teaches cooperation. =
=====

... ..

Date: 1 Aug 94 18:46:26 GMT
From: lll-winken.llnl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!
abercrombie.Stanford.EDU!paulf@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <072994182402Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>, <wyn.81.2E3CEBA2@ornl.gov>,
<31j949\$qqq@chnews.intel.com>ate.w
Subject : Re: What is wrong with ham radio

Cecil_A_Moore@ccm.ch.intel.com writes:

>You finally got it... I think those guys could be convinced to become hams
>if it weren't for the CW requirement. It appears to me that the act of
>learning CW tends to block an RF engineer's ability to innovate since most
>RF innovations are coming from outside the ham community.

You know, I'm actually going to enjoy watching you prove this conjecture.

Not only is it false on the face of things (the *vast* majority of RF
engineers are hams), but now you've claimed interference between a cognitive
skill and creativity in an unrelated area. Let me guess, your next connection
will be between the SL9-Jupiter collision and Green Card Lawyer spam?

--
-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The Enemy of the Good is the Better."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Gen. William "Wild Bill" Donovan

Date: 1 Aug 94 19:08:02 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!news.acns.nwu.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!sdd.hp.com!
spool.mu.edu!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!abercrombie.Stanford.EDU!
paulf@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <40.2570.2427@channel1.com>, <31egj6\$2rm@nyx10.cs.du.edu>,

<31gssb\$39m@news.tamu.edu>ool
Subject : Re: What is wrong with h

furuta@cs.tamu.edu (Richard Furuta) writes:

>Well, it's not a *technical* innovation, but I suspect that there would be very
>few SAREX missions without the No Code license---how many of the astronauts
>have passed a CW test?

Yes, but we're discussing *technical* innovations, like those heavily promised
by the nuke-the-code crowd. Stop applying grease and stick to the topic.

--

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The Enemy of the Good is the Better."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Gen. William "Wild Bill" Donovan

Date: Mon, 1 Aug 1994 12:33:38 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!cs.utk.edu!stc06.CTD.ORNL.GOV!
xdepc.eng.ornl.gov!wyn@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <318of3\$3h6@chnews.intel.com>, <wyn.78.2E3936EA@ornl.gov>,
<072994182402Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>
Subject : Re: What is wrong with ham radio

In article <072994182402Rnf0.78@amcomp.com> dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill)
writes:

>wyn@ornl.gov (C. C. Wynn) writes:

>>In article <318of3\$3h6@chnews.intel.com> Cecil_A_Moore@ccm.hf.intel.com writes:
>>
>>Don't believe everything you read. Everyone's brain is capable of functioning
>>as a modem. At least, you'd better hope. Visual and audible communications
>>depend on it.

>Thank you Doctor.

>>>>In other words, the filter is working.

>>

>>>The filter is working to keep some of the brightest people out of ham radio.
>>>Why should a spread spectrum expert with a PHD degree in electronics
>>>have to learn Morse code? Nobody makes the CW people learn spread
>>>spectrum. Is CW more important than all other modes combined?

>>

1. KA2WEU 2. K9AY 3. W6SAI

=====

= Cooperation requires participation. Competition teaches cooperation. =

=====

• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •

References <40.2553.2427@channel1.com>, <Ctpxu1.I1y@news.Hawaii.Edu>,
<073094235258Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>prima
Subject : Re: What is wrong with h (what was this word?)

>There you go again Jeff. Stating as FACT something that is just your
>biased observation. The latest survey stated only 38% regularly use morse.
>Your 50% quote is imagined.

```
--
-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The Enemy of the Good is the Better."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Gen. William "Wild Bill" Donovan
```

Date: 1 Aug 1994 21:42:45 GMT
From: cs.utexas.edu!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!jms@uunet.uu.net

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <318of3\$3h6@chnews.intel.com>, <Ctou9H.5y3@news.Hawaii.Edu>,
<072994181451Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>

Subject : Re: What is wrong with ham radio

: jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

: And others can not confirm your account. Personally I worked 20 meters for
: a good portion of field day and heard VERY little morse CW.

Your receiver doesn't work on 20 meters.

Mike, K0TER

Date: Mon, 1 Aug 1994 12:08:08 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!cs.utk.edu!stc06.CTD.ORNL.GOV!
xdepc.eng.ornl.gov!wyn@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <318of3\$3h6@chnews.intel.com>, <wyn.78.2E3936EA@ornl.gov>,
<31bobe\$mch@chnews.intel.com>, ù

Subject : Re: What is wrong with ham radio

In article <31bobe\$mch@chnews.intel.com> Cecil_A_Moore@ccm.hf.intel.com writes:

>In article <wyn.78.2E3936EA@ornl.gov>, C. C. Wynn <wyn@ornl.gov> wrote:

>>Everyone's brain is capable of functioning as a modem.

>You said everyone... how about the late Helen Keller?

She probably could have learned the code and become an excellent operator.
I know several physically challenged people who have met the requirements,
become excellent hams, use CW, and have a great public service record to show
for it. Physical limitations are covered on the back of the 610 form.

>You have missed the point entirely, Clay. The RF engineers that I mentioned
>are not suffering because they are not hams... HAM RADIO IS SUFFERING
>BECAUSE THEY ARE NOT HAMS. Some of these guys who can pass the Extra test
>in their sleep would be barred from advancing beyond Tech because they don't
>see the need to learn a mode that most other services have given up on.
>This is a good example of the CW requirement contributing to the dumbing

>down of ham radio. Knowledge and technical expertise shrink to insignificance
>in the face of the almighty _MORSE_CODE_.

I don't think so. At the risk of plagerizing other's comments, there are
excellent RF engineers who are hams. Also, there are excellent RF engineers
who are not hams. Ham radio is not for everybody. Ham radio is not
necessarily and should not be just an enclave for RF engineers.

73,
C. C. (Clay) Wynn N4AOX
wyn@ornl.gov

=====
= Cooperation requires participation. Competition teaches cooperation. =
=====

... _ _ _ . _... _ _ . _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _

Date: 2 Aug 1994 02:39:28 GMT
From: noc.near.net!chaos.dac.neu.edu!lynx.dac.neu.edu!dcassell@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <RFM.94Jul28114527@urth.eng.sun.com>,<319k98\$ncg@chaos.dac.neu.edu>,
<31avfv\$5h2@news.iastate.edu>,<t0JEkiubG648066yn@access.digex.net>
Subject : Re: Digital mode subbands

Andy Domonkos (domonkos@access.digex.net) wrote:

: Not understanding the theory is ALL the justification needed to keep
: un-qualified operators off HF. I'm getting tired of new-ops asking me
: how to measure SWR on a 2M rig and the antenna. What was all that stuff
: for in the study guides then? I would have been laughed
: off the air (hell, I would've been ashamed to ask it) 17 years ago. These
: folks should have bought their GMRS license and be satisfied w/that.

: Andy

Get off it. Ham radio, in it's most basic form, is about experimenting.
The theory written does *NOT*, in any form, explain to new operators how
to purchase one of the myriads of SWR meters, attach it to their rig,
and measure the SWR off the antenna. It explains the theory behind SWR,
but the question pools do not have any realistic guide to daily
operation.

I *DID* study the theory, and believe me, I had plenty of questions to

ask, even after I earned my Extra Class. Even if you consider a new hams question "stupid" or whatever, are you not going to help because you are bitter that someone who was eager to get their license not only did so, but had the gall to ask you a question? You're attitude is an insult to ham radio operators and what they stand for.

Perhaps you should have bought a GMRS license and confined your complaining to that.

Damon Cassell, WU1T
dcassell@lynx.dac.neu.edu

Date: 2 Aug 1994 02:32:21 GMT
From: noc.near.net!chaos.dac.neu.edu!lynx.dac.neu.edu!dcassell@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <RFM.94Jul27113836@urth.eng.sun.com>,
<RFM.94Jul28114527@urth.eng.sun.com>,<319k98\$ncg@chaos.dac.neu.edu>,
<31avfv\$5h2@news.iastate.edu>
Subject : Re: Digital mode subbands (was Re: CW is FUN!! reprise)

: It does if you are suggesting--like an earlier poster--that digital operation
: should not be allowed for any ham without a general class license. What makes
: the general class so special?

I am not saying that the General class should have digital privileges that lower classes cannot. I would actually be interested in seeing a class of license created (or an existing one modified) to allow limited HF digital and voice communications (beyond that which the Novice provides).

I think it is time to create a license structure geared towards allowing a prospective ham to select his or her level of technical ability and take an exam that would reward the operating privileges that person desires. The currant caste system of heirarchal licensing is hopelessly outdated and does little to encourage actually learning the testing material.

As for CW, why should hams who only desire voice communications on a spectrum limited only to an Extra Class be subjected to a 20 WPM exam if they are never going to see code again? Instead, why not create an alternative exam designed specifically for a voice or digitally oriented ham. Of course that would do little to foster the "tradition" of CW, but why do we need to foster a mode that is the technological equivalent of a dinosaur. In an age of high tech automobiles, airplanes, and spacetravel, why are we selling hams the Flintstone's footpowered car?

As for the older generation of hams who "had to do it, so should you", perhaps we should subject them to rigorous examinations on digital modes such as packet.

Most of the licensing debate comes from deep within an old generation of hams who are frightened at the prospect of losing their last frontier to the technology armed hams eager to share the airwaves. It's time to take stock in what matters and what does not.

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #343
